

REMARKS

The Examiner's Action dated May 31, 2006, has been received and its content carefully noted.

In response to the objections presented in sections 1 and 2 of the Action, each of claims 10 and 18 has been amended to specify that each of the ribs has a bottom and a top. Nevertheless, it is believed appropriate to point out that each of these claims originally defined "upwardly extending ribs" and any structure that extends upwardly inherently has a bottom and a top.

The indication of substantive allowability of claims 7, 9, 10, 15, 17 and 18 is noted with appreciation. However, these claims have been retained in dependent form because parent claim 1 has been amended in a manner that is believed to clearly distinguish patentably over the applied references.

The present invention, as defined in application claim 1, is directed to a case for a household electric appliance, which case includes a base having an outer lateral wall provided with a passage, a water reservoir disposed above the base and a signal light provided in the base under the reservoir. According to the invention, the case further include a light conducting window mounted in the passage and disposed to be illuminated by the signal light. In addition, the window is fixed to the water reservoir.

Since the window is both disposed to be illuminated by the signal light and is fixed to the water reservoir, it will provide, through the passage in the outer lateral wall of the base, a visible indicating signal at the outer lateral wall and illumination that will extend into the reservoir to allow the water level in the reservoir to be observed.

The prior art rejection presented in section 4 of the action is traversed for the reason that the applied reference, Rojas, does not disclose a device having a base with an outer lateral wall provided with a passage, or, it follows, a light conducting window mounted in that passage.

Because the case defined in claim 1 has an outer lateral wall provided with the passage and a light conducting window mounted in that passage, it is clear that the structure defined in claim 1 differs fundamentally from that disclosed by Rojas and that the light source of Rojas performs a function fundamentally different from that of the signal light according to the present invention.

The rejection presented in section 7 of the action is also respectfully traversed for the reason that the case defined in the rejected claims is not suggested by any reasonable combination of the teachings of the applied references.

The primary reference, Kohn, also fails to disclose a case that includes a base having an outer lateral wall provided with a passage, or a light conducting window mounted in that passage. In Kohn, the light illuminates the entire reservoir, rather than being localized at an outer lateral wall passage, as is done in the present invention.

These shortcomings are not supplied by the secondary reference, Glucksman. This reference discloses a steamer provided with a neon indicator lamp. The only disclosure of the location of that lamp appears in figure 1 of the patent drawing, which shows the lamp as being located within the outer wall of the base and apparently extending fully to the outer surface of that wall. In other words, this reference does not disclose a window mounted in a passage in an outer lateral wall of the base to be illuminated by a signal light.

Moreover, there is no indication in this secondary reference that light from the indicator lamp will serve to illuminate the water level indicator on the wall of the reservoir. This latter consideration is particularly relevant to application claims 5 and 11-13, which specifies that the window is composed of a tongue that extends from the reservoir. This is not disclosed in either reference. Each of these claims further defines a pane of light conducting material that is disposed in a lateral wall of the reservoir

Appln. No. 10/779,608
Amd. dated August 28, 2006
Reply to Office Action of May 31, 2006

and forms a water level indicator. This is also not disclosed in either reference.

Added claims 20 and 21 further define the essential distinctions between the present invention and the combinations of the teachings of the applied references. Claim 20 specifies that the signal light is enclosed by the outer lateral wall of the base, while claim 21 explicitly sets forth that the pane forming a water level indicator is illuminated by the signal light.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that all of the claims now in the application clearly distinguish patentability over the applied references and it is therefore requested that the rejections of record be reconsidered and withdrawn, that the pending claims be allowed and that the application be found in allowable condition.

If the above amendment should not now place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is


Appln. No. 10/779,608
Amd. dated August 28, 2006
Reply to Office Action of May 31, 2006

invited to call undersigned counsel to resolve any remaining
issues.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant

By


Jay M. Finkelstein
Registration No. 21

JMF:cak
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\bN\s\seb\dumoux4\2006-08-23 AMENDMENT.doc